

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 13-20, and 22-24 are pending in the present patent application. Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-11, 13, 19, 20 and 22-24 are rejected. Claims 9 and 14-18 are objected to. By this amendment, claims 9 and 14 have been amended. This application continues to include claims 1, 2, 4-11, 13-20, and 22-24.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 9 and 14-18 contain allowable subject matter. Claims 9 and 14 have been modified to be in independent form, including all the limitations of the respective base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claims 9 and 14-18 are allowable in their present form.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-11, 13, 19, 20 and 22-24 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 10, 20 and 23-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,287,164 (Watanabe).

In response to the Examiner's comments relating to Applicants' arguments of patentability over Watanabe, Applicants respectfully disagree, and incorporate by reference those previous arguments.

In the configuration of Watanabe, first tray 54 has an upper media sheet and second tray 53 has an upper media sheet, each of which can be selectively picked as the "top sheet" by selective placement of pickup roller 37. In contrast, in the configuration of claim 1, the top sheet can only be in one of the first media tray and said second media tray, i.e., the top sheet is the uppermost sheet of both trays together. As set forth in Watanabe at col. 5, lines 5-12, "When the paper P<sub>2</sub> stored on the second stacking plate 54 is to be taken out, a similar operation is performed. That is, as shown in FIG. 10, the support frame 40 of the *paper takeout mechanism 30*

is moved forward by driving of the third drive motor 42, and then moved downward by driving of the fourth drive motor 46, so that the pickup roller 37 is located on the uppermost sheet of the paper P<sub>2</sub>.”

Watanabe does not disclose, teach or suggest, as recited in claim 1, “a sheet feeder mechanism having a sheet picking roller located to pick a top sheet of print media in said print media source, said top sheet of print media being located in only one of said first media tray and said second media tray, said sheet feeder mechanism including a biasing mechanism coupled to said sheet picking roller, said sheet picking roller being biased by said biasing mechanism to move in a first direction to engage said top sheet of print media, regardless of which of said first media tray and said second media tray contains said top sheet of print media.”

Watanabe is not configured to bias the sheet picking roller in a first direction to engage said top sheet of print media, regardless of which of said first media tray and said second media tray contains said top sheet of print media, but rather in order to access the bottom tray, Watanabe discloses that the *paper takeout mechanism 30* is moved forward by driving of the third drive motor 42, and then moved downward by driving of the fourth drive motor 46. (See Watanabe Figs. 9, 10 and 11).

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed allowable over Watanabe.

Rejected claims 2 and 5-8 and 10 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 2 and 5-8 and 10 are also believed allowable in their present form. In addition, claims 2 and 5-8 and 10 further and patentably define the present invention over Watanabe.

Claim 20 is believed allowable for substantially the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 23 recites, in part, “a primary media tray for holding a primary print media; a frame including a cross support that extends across a width of said primary media tray; and an auxiliary media tray pivotably coupled to said cross support, said auxiliary media tray being configured for holding a second print media.” (Emphasis added).

In rejecting claim 23 the Examiner relies on structure “near 54a” as corresponding to the recited cross support. However, in Watanabe, no cross support structure “near 54a” extends across a width of the primary media tray and to which the auxiliary tray is pivotably coupled. (See, e.g., Watanabe Figs. 6, 7 and 8).

Accordingly, claim 23 is believed allowable over Watanabe.

Claim 24 is believed allowable in its present form in view of its dependence from claim 23.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 2, 5-8, 10, 20 and 23-24 are not anticipated by Watanabe under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 10-11, 13, 19, 20, and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 4,087,178 (Pfeifer, et al.).

Pfeifer, et al. discloses a cassette comprising a box (1) having a cover (2) with a slot (3) and a deflectable bottom wall (6) supporting a stack (4). The cassette is a single tray configured with slot (3) to accommodate the manual feeding of an extra sheet (30) in addition to the automatic feeding facilitated by deflectable bottom wall (6). The extra sheet (30) is manually fed “onto the top of the stack 4” supported by bottom wall (6). (Col. 4, ll. 12-17; emphasis added). Thus, surface 2a of cover 2 and slot 3 do not constitute a second media tray, but rather provide an alternative path to the top of stack 4 supported by bottom wall 6 to accommodate the feeding of a single extra sheet (30).

Further, the recited second media tray in Applicants' claims is for holding second "print media" (plural form of print medium). In Pfeifer, et al., surface 2a of cover 2 and slot 3 are not configured for handling multiple sheets.

Thus, as to claims 1, 11, 20 and 23, and claims depending therefrom, Pfeifer, et al. does not disclose a second media tray for holding a second print media, as recited in Applicants' claims.

Further, with respect to claim 6, the grounds for rejection asserted by the Examiner do not appear to be supported by Pfeifer. Claim 6 recites, "The imaging apparatus of claim 5, wherein said second media tray pivots at said at least one pivot joint to contact an upper media sheet of said first print media in said first media tray." The Examiner relies on the pivot (near 1) illustrated in Pfeifer Figs. 1 and 2 in rejecting claim 5, from which claim 6 depends. However, the pivoting so illustrated (near 1) discloses the loading of the cassette in the machine (used in rejecting claim 5), and such pivoting would not result in the second tray 6 contacting the upper sheet of the alleged first tray 2. Rather, if a sheet was present in slot 3, any contact between the sheet in the slot media tray 6 would occur before cartridge insertion into the machine, and thus prior to the alleged pivoting of claim 5 (near 1).

Accordingly, claim 6 is believed patentable over Pfeifer, et al. for these additional reasons.

Also, claim 8 recites, "The imaging apparatus of claim 5, wherein said mounting frame includes a cross support extending across a width of said first media tray." In rejecting claim 8, the Examiner relies on upstanding projections 1a as corresponding to the recited cross support. However, as shown Pfeifer Fig. 1, upstanding projections 1a do not extend across the width of the first media tray at all, but rather extend upwardly from the sidewalls.

Accordingly, claim 8 is believed patentable over Pfeifer, et al. for these additional reasons.

Claim 23 recites, in part, a frame including a cross support that extends across a width of said primary media tray; and an auxiliary media tray pivotably coupled to said cross support, said auxiliary media tray being configured for holding a second print media.

The Examiner's basis for rejecting claim 23 is not understood. Applicants do not identify any cross support that extends across the width of the primary media tray (near 1e) to which as auxiliary tray 6 is pivotably coupled, as asserted by the Examiner. Rather, Pfeifer, et al. discloses at col. 3, ll. 36-38 that tray 6 has pivots 6a that are received in slots 7 in the sidewalls of box 1. (See also, Pfeifer, et al. Fig. 2).

Accordingly, claim 23 is believed patentable over Pfeifer, et al.

For at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 10-11, 13, 19, 20, and 22-24 are not anticipated by Pfeifer, et al. under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

The present application is believed allowable in its present form, and it is respectfully requested that the Examiner so find and issue a Notice of Allowance in due course.

In the event Applicants have overlooked the need for an extension of time, an additional extension of time, payment of fee, or additional payment of fee, Applicants hereby conditionally petition therefor and authorize that any charges be made to Deposit Account No. 20-0095, TAYLOR & AUST, P.C.

Should any question concerning any of the foregoing arise, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (317) 894-0801.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ronald K. Aust/

Ronald K. Aust  
Registration No. 36,735

Attorney for Applicant

RKA/ts

Electronically Filed: April 17, 2007

TAYLOR & AUST, P.C.  
12029 E. Washington Street  
Indianapolis, IN 46229  
Telephone: 317-894-0801  
Facsimile: 317-894-0803